IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 1009 /2002

PETITIONER : Tobacco Employees Union through its Vice-President Abdul Rashid, S/o Abdul Tahir, aged 34 years, R/o w-1, Janta Quarter, Padmanabhpur, Durg (C.G.).

-VERSUS-

RESPONDENTS :

1. Union of India through Secretary, Department of Finance, New Delhi.
2. Commissioner, Central Excise, New Delhi.
3. Superintendent, Customs and Central Excise, Range Durg (C.G.).
4. State of Chhattisgarh through Secretary, Department of Labour, D.K.S.Bhavan, Raipur.
5. Secretary, Department of Revenue, State of Chhattisgarh, D.K.S.Bhavan, Raipur.
6. Labour Commissioner, Government of Chhattisgarh, Raipur.
7. Deputy Labour Commissioner, State of Chhattisgarh, Raipur.
8. Collector, Durg.
9. Assistant Labour Commissioner, Durg.
10. Tahsildar, Durg.
11. M.P. Tobacco Limited, a Company incorporated under the Companies Act, 1956, Registration no. 39761 of 1985, having its Office at Phulgaon, Potia Road, Durg (C.G.) through its Director Manohar Ram, S/o Prayag Ram, aged about 38 years, R/o New Delhi, India.

R.R. No. 964/12 Presented by Shri Sanjay Agrawal dated 10.6.12

WRIT UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A SUITABLE WRIT, ORDERS OR DIRECTION.

RECEIVED COPY.

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

(23)

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.No.1005 / सन् 2002

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	03/01/2003 Shri Rajeev Shrivastava, counsel for the petitioner. Shri A.S. Gaharwar, Sr. Central Government Standing Counsel for Uion of India/respondent nos. 1 to 3 on advance copy. Shri Sanjay K. Agarwal, Deputy Advocate General for respondents no. 4 to 10. None for respondent no.11. It is stated by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the Revenue Recovery Proceedings were stayed by the Tahsildar, Durg – respondent no.10 because the properties of the respondent no.11 had been confiscated by the Union of India. However, subsequent thereto, it is stated by him, that order has been set aside and he would like to bring this fact to the notice of respondent no.10 before whom the recovery proceedings are pending. In this view of the matter, he is permitted to withdraw this writ petition with liberty to move an appropriate application before the Recovery Officer. A copy of the application should be served on the employer who should be given sometime to file a reply and thereafter the Recovery Officer is to proceed on merits and in accordance with law after ascertaining as to whether or not the order of confiscation has been withdrawn. It is – 2 –	

[पीछे देखिये

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

(54)

मामला क्रमांक W.P.(C) No. 1002/ सन् 2002

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	expected that efforts should be made to complete the proceedings within a reasonable period. With the aforesaid observations and directions this writ petition is disposed of as withdrawn. Consequently, M.W.P.No. 367/2002 for interim relief, I. A.Nos.3211/2002 for urgent hearing and I.A.No. 7511/2002 for a direction to the respondents also stand disposed of. Certified copy as per rules. **Sd/-** **P.C. Naik** **Judge**	

[पीछे देखिये